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I. Introduction

• Reporting on the absentative (prioritive, inaccessible; Goddard 1979a,b, Pentland 2000a,b) in Penobscot, an Eastern Abenaki dialect of central Maine.
• Discussion of form and function (sects. II & III) limited here so as to better cover absentative conjunct and absentative locative analysis (IV); which leads to a tentative suggestion towards the solution of certain historical reconstruction problems for the E. Algonquian absentative and subjunctive (V)

II. Form

Absentative affixes (Penobscot)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animate</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Obv. Singular</th>
<th>Obv. Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>animate</td>
<td>-a, -oka¹</td>
<td>-oka</td>
<td>-kal</td>
<td>-ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-oka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-absentative affixes (Penobscot)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animate</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Obv. Singular</th>
<th>Obv. Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>animate</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>-ak, -ok, -ik</td>
<td>-al, -ol, -il</td>
<td>-a, -o, -ih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>-al, -ol, -il</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-an outgrowth (or rather “ingrowth”) of the “peripheral” endings (hence partial fusion w/ anim., num, obv.)

Absentative demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANIMATE</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Obv. Singular</th>
<th>Obv. Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>owoka</td>
<td>owokik</td>
<td>owekal</td>
<td>oweka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distal</td>
<td>noka</td>
<td>nokik</td>
<td>nekal</td>
<td>neka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supradistal</td>
<td>iyoka</td>
<td>iyokik</td>
<td>[unattested]</td>
<td>[unattested]²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INANIMATE singular | plural
| proximal | weke | wekal¹ |
| distal | neke | nekal |
| supradistal | iyeke | iyekal |

Non-Absentative demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANIMATE</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Obv. Singular</th>
<th>Obv. Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>owa</td>
<td>iyokik</td>
<td>iyolil</td>
<td>iyohi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distal</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>nikik</td>
<td>nilil</td>
<td>nihi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supradistal²</td>
<td>iya</td>
<td>iyekik</td>
<td>iyelil</td>
<td>iyehi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INANIMATE singular | plural
| proximal | iyo | iyolil |
| distal | ni | nilil |
| supradistal | iye | iyelil |
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Absentative concord is strikingly inconsistent

demonstrative discourse-nominal concord:

(1) ...wəsəm kotəkə ketosisanawa.

wəsəm kotəkə ketosisanawa.

because other.ANS 2-daughter-dim-1pl.ANS

‘...because of our other little deceased daughter.’ (məlkohk:13)

demonstrative-nominal lack of concord:

(2) kəspə, nɪ wə naməhsomsə, kët-ačəssəhtəkə, ...

kəspə, nɪ wə naməhsomsə, kət-ačəssəhtəkə

so-you.see then this.ANS 1-[grandfather]-ABS.ANS
great-[dragonfly]

‘So you see, at that time my dead grandfather, Old Dragon Fly, ...’

nominal-verb lack of concord (here of contextually identical referents):

(3) məstɪtə nəkəhənəkə, məstɪtə səkəskəcəkəhəsolətəwək.

məstɪtə nəkəhənəkə, məstɪtə səkəskəcəkəhəsolətəwək.

all=EMP entirely-die.?-AN-W-ABS.ANpl

məstɪtə səkəskəcəkəhəsolətəwək.

all=EMP to.pieces-squishy.mass-[change.quickly.?-AN]-W-[ANpl]-W.ANSpl

‘They all died, they all tore to squishy bits.’ (Speck: Kanawəs#2; my gloss)

verb-nominal lack of concord common:

(4) nə sənəpe weləməhtəkə, məhčina.

nə sənəpe weləməhtəkə, məhčina.

that.ANS [man] C-good-behave.caus.T.?-ANcj end-suffer.?AN-W-ABS.AN

‘that man who was kind, died’ (S: 72:104)

(5) nəyo ehtahsi-siɬəkə, pəčəhləte awikəwəmək, wənìsəwəhətəciɬ mehčinekə.

nəyo ehtahsi-siɬəkə, pəčəhləte awikəwəmək, wənìsəwəhətəciɬ mehčinekə.

nì yə [e].htahs-siɬəkən-k

so this.IN C.every-spring.?-AN-INcj

pet-hl.ə-t-e

arrive-go.?ANcj-ABS.IN

awikəwəm-ək

3-house-LOC

wa-nəsəwəhətəɬt-əl

3-two.W.?AN-pl.ANcj-obl

məhčtən-e-[w]-ək-əl

end-suffer.?AN-W-ABS.obl

‘So every spring, when he arrived at his house, his wife was dead.’ (kəsəhlət (G.D., revised version);1; my gloss)

only clear case: concord btw transferee argument wətapə ‘h/ her head (abs.)’ & verb -əłaməhke- ‘throw away’:

(6) ən nə, eli-sənləkətə, eləməhəkəte wətapə.

ən nə, eli-sənləkətə, eləməhəkəte wətapə.

ən nə [e]-əl-sənləkət-t

well then C-in...way-[blow.nose.]-ANcj

[ə]-əłaməhke.e-t-e

C-away-throw.?ANcj-ABS.IN

wətapə

3-head-ABS.IN

‘Well then, as he blew his nose he popped off [lit. threw away] what had been his head.’ (ēnìkəs:6)

• note: fewer chances for v-n concord attestation, h/c periph. abs. is, well, absent in conj, subord., ANpat forms
• verbal concord seems only consistently attested on verbs with “inherently absentative” semantics?

(7) sleep:
   a. kawosána.  
      kaw.i-[w]-asahan-a  
      sleep.?_AN-W-SAN-ABS.AN
      ‘Oh! he is asleep; so he is asleep’
   b. kawosánikak.
      kaw.i-[w]-asahani-àk.àk  
      sleep.?_AN-W-SAN-ABS.ANpl
      ‘Oh! they (2) are asleep; so they are asleep’ (S:74:41)

(8) death:
   nìyo ehtahsi-sìkak, pečíhlote awikwawomàk, wànisìwíahùcìl mehčínëkal.
   ni yo [e].htahs-sìk.an.k  
   so this.IN C.every.spring.?_IN-INcj
   pet-hl.a-t-e  
   arrive-go.?_ANcj-ABS.IN
   a-wikwawom-àk  
   3-house-LOC
   ‘So every spring, when he arrived at his house, his wife was dead.’ (késîhlolë (G.D.rev. v.); 1; my gloss)

(9) disappearance:
   ònsøte mánamà, wànhlowàslòtakak.  
   ònsø=tte  
   truly=EMP
   manàna  
   as.if
   wan-hl.a-w-sìjat.i-[w]-àk.àk  
   lost-go.?_AN-W-[xpl.?_AN]-W-ABS.ANpl
   ‘“In fact it seems they disappeared at some previous time.”’ (nekawokamàssàk ahotenàyìkÀ:4)

(10) nà këëkikílihsëwal9 wáthlàn, “tàn nsìsaK?”
    wáthlakon, “tëhtàkàl10 wàtalàmiptòne.”
    nì [këëkikílihsò]-al  
    then chickadee-obv
    wa-hl.a-one  
    3-tell.dir_AN/N
    tàn  
    where
    n-sìsaK  
    1-eye
    wa-hl.a-one  
    3-tell.inv_AN
    tìhtàkàlì  
    great.horned.owl
    wa-sìm-p.t.aw-one-e  
    3-away-[snatch].T.?_AN-N-ABS.IN
    ‘Then he said to Chickadee, “Where is my eye?” Then (Chickadee) said to him, “Great Horned Owl took it (away).”’
    (Speck:12 (my gloss))

(11) nà petäkòkàhak epàhstàKë, ahà, n’wàsòkìhkìstahùn skòwttam, n’wàpàkahàton, wàtalàmnì-Kas’sì]hàttòne11 tolàpe wàpeskàhòtì.
    nì [e]-pet-àkàh.an-àk12  
    C-arrive-[float.].?_INcj
    epàhs-øtòKë  
    half-river-E
    ahà  
    yes
    nì  
    then
    wa-sòdëh-kàtòhì-one  
    3-into.view-[jump].?_AN-N
    askòwttam  
    trout
    then
    wa-pàke-hàt.aw-one  
    wa-sìm-p.Kàs-hàt.aw-one-e  
    3-away-swallow-[change].T.?_AN-N-ABS.IN
    tolàpe  
    turtle
    wa-peskàwàh-òtì  
    3-burst]-device
    ‘When it had floated halfway across the river, yes, then a trout jumped into view, then he bit it, he swallowed up Turtle’s gun.’
    (Speck:15)
the above forms in addition demonstrate Penobscot conflation of Cree/Fox (Pentland 2000) inaccessible vs. (strict) absentative distinction to a single paradigm (=“unavailable”?)

### III. Usage

(12) **Animate:**

a. wämôhsomškakal ‘h/er deceased grandfather’, pl. wämôhsomšaka (cf. wämôhsomšal ‘h/er grandfather; h/er stepfather’)

b. nakôtaka ‘my former/lost knee’,\(^{13}\) pl. nakôtakokal (cf. nakotak AN ‘my knee’)

(13) **Inanimate:**

a. nísise ‘my former/lost eye’, pl. nísisekalkal (cf. nísisek IN ‘my eye’)

b. ntawaka ‘my former/lost ear’; pl. ntawakokal (cf. ntawak IN ‘my ear’)

-can be physically present, but discursively unavailable (as in presentative colloc. [dem.] + **tahk**)

(14) **Animate:**

naste watalam-kipiłcon wapsk; pihtes elihlošt, wokatahk čitianáhkíhaso, mehčine.

-can be dead/absent but not absentative:

(15) mëkak wakisi-komotanotáménc, natákitonam, na nəkésči-kisashti.

(16) kënoq aŋk̬ níhkap, ahtx pâmówawisi, owa kës-sakəmə, òpátehtek.
Extant vs. non-extant absentatives?
-data is rather unclear (a few examples from PD ms., none in text)

(17a)  natol IN ‘my watercraft, boat, canoe’, pl. natolal
prior. (still in existence):
  natolawe ‘my former canoe (lost, missing, sold, stolen)’, pl. natolokal
prior.: (no longer in existence):
  natole ‘my former canoe’, pl. natolokal

(17b)  natápasim AN ‘my tree’
prior.: (in existence):
  natápasíma, pl. natápasimátkik
prior.: (not in existence):
  natápasimáka, pl. natápasimákak

(17c)  ottólhøwe AN ‘sleeveless body garment or wrap (made of hide), stole; shirt’
prior. (still in existence):
  natottólhøwa AN ‘my former...’, pl. natottolhøwékak
  natottolhøwénokak AN ‘our former...[pl.]’
  wattotollhøwéokak AN ‘their former...[pl.]’
prior.: (no longer in existence):
  natottolhøwékak AN ‘my former...’ pl. natottolhøwékak
  natottolhøwénokak AN ‘our former...[pl.]’
  wattotollhøwéokak AN ‘their former...[pl.]’

(17d)  natáhtøpi AN ‘my bow’
prior.: (still in existence):
  natáhtøpika[k] (no sg. given)
prior.: (no longer in existence):
  natáhtøpaya ‘my former bow, lost bow’, pl. natáhtørikak

(17e)  natáhtøpínawak AN ‘our bows’
  natáhtøpínokak ‘our former bows (still in existence)’
  natáhtøpínokak ‘our former bows (no longer in existence)’

- at least one clear pattern: pl. non-extant abs. = marked penult. (s.v.) accent
  (cf. default antepenult for pl. extant abs.)
  others: special marking sg. (-ow-, -ók-) is unclear, re extant~non-extant.

- PD notes rather explicitly absentative extant~non-extant contrast; but details remain murky.

IV. Is there an absentative conjunct? An absentative locative?
- traditional Algonquianist “subjunctive” = conj. + |-e|19

(18)  kahsihpótoke, katsi-l-námíhto, kkókówimun.

kahs-hpo.taw-ke
wipe-[oscillate] TANcj-ABS.IN
ka-ol-nam.h.t.aw-one
2-in-way-see.TANcj-N
ka-kakow-m-a-one
2-rough-speak.with.dirTAN-N

‘If he erases it, be sure to scold him.’
(S:60:8:17)

- this |-e| is IN absentative singular |-e|; subjunctive = absentative conjunct
**Penobscot subjunctive usage:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>w/o initial change</th>
<th>protasis of conditionals and of counterfactuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w/ initial change (=changed subjunctives)</td>
<td>subordinate events that are real but inaccessible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: What’s being relativized? (cf. agt, pat; rel root [=accessible/immediate event/times])
A: “inaccessible” event/times
   = hypothetical or idealized (=conditional, counterfactual),
   = no longer accessibly the case (changed subjunctive use)
   = precisely the criteria for absentative marking...hence conj. + |-e|

- |-e| is IN absentative morpheme marking the inacessibility of that relativized event/time

**Immediate advantages:**
(a) fits with general pattern of periph. agr. on rel. cl. conjuncts---i.e. conj. participials
(b) simplifies overall morphological lexicon: one |-e| rather than two, accounting for
   the semantic range of uses of various |-e|s in one fell swoop

**CAVEAT:** |-e| might be agr. for abstract IN event-time head, or might just be default
   (cf. IN/least-marked verbal agr. for clausal complements of verbs)

**Absentative conjunct with initial change (changed subjunctive)**

‘inaccessible realis event’ inferred from consistency in pragmatic content of ch. subjunctives
---i.e. seem to be used for realis events which are somehow distanced or inaccessible

**How this derives:**
- **reals** associated with initial change
  = corollary to Brittain 2001: unchanged conj. generally used with **irrealis** contexts
- distancing/inaccessibility = effect of the absentative

**Where the changed abs. conj. appears:**

- **collocations emphasizing the distance between two times or states:**
  (19)  **tan nekette ewossisowisang**
         **tan**  nekette  **[e]-awu-shs-s-aw1-t-asah-are**
         how    NEKE-ENMPH  C-child-dim-dim-W.?ANj-ANej-SAN-ABS-IN
         ‘ever since he was a child’  (Siebert 1988:748)

- **conjuncts referring to realis times that are discursively unavailable:**
  (20) a.  **piwsossoyan**  **[e]-piwshs-s-aw1-t-asah-are**
         ‘when you were very small’  C-small-dim-dim-W.?ANj-ANej-SAN-ABS-IN

  b.  **pahpiwsossoyan**  **[e]-R-piwshs-s-aw1-t-asah-are**
         ‘when you were very very small’  C-R-small-dim-dim-W.?ANj-ANej-SAN-ABS-IN
         (S.30:back page notes)

- pragmatic content of these 3 examples is of an event-time, childhood, that humans typically speak of
  with a **distancing** contrast, i.e. between that long-lost state and **now**
- other unreachable realis relativizes: collocation with ton=eht 'how + [uncertain]' = rhetorically “inaccessible” degree, e.g.:

“inaccessible” height:

(21) kkiy, ni ákač ni owa mkasew-álamos, èska ni elipháketapen, iyótahk ákač iye nihkoíni, pemsékhlót wáčo,

\[ ton \text{ eht espahsekíhlakkke, tekakópite, iye awépi. } \]

\[ \text{kkiy} \quad \text{ni=ákač} \quad \text{ni owa mkasew-álamos} \quad \text{ëska ni [e]-ol.ph.a[k.e-t-]} \]

\[ \text{ah!} \quad \text{then=QT=FUT then this.AN black-[dog]} \quad \text{still then C-in...way-[flee].?ANj-ANcj-PAN} \]

\[ \text{iyó=tahk-a[k.e-]c} \quad \text{iyé níhkoan-} \]

\[ \text{this.IN=DEIC=QT=FUT yonder m.front-1WI} \quad \text{C-along-ledge-go.?ANj-} \]

\[ \text{wačo} \quad \text{mountain} \]

\[ \text{ton=eht} \quad \text{[e]-asp-ahsek-hl-o-w-e} \quad \text{[e]-takak-qi-t-e} \quad \text{iyé awep-twí} \]

\[ \text{how=UNC C-along-ledge-go.?} \quad \text{NEG=ANcj-ABS.IN} \quad \text{C-ending.at...-look.?} \quad \text{up-1WI} \]

‘Ah! Consequently while the black dog had been in pursuit, here behold, at a distance ahead a mountain would rise precipitously, so that to whatever heights its crags might extend, to yonder place above was as far as he could look.’

\( (\text{msáhtawe:18}) \)

- **(ton eht) espahsekíhlakkke** ‘however high its ledges might (not\(^2^4\)) go’;
- **tekakópite.** ‘as far as he could look\(^{23}\)

--- abs. gives narrative emphasis on an fantastically unreachable height

“inaccessible” height: exaggerative emphasis on the size of mound [tain!] of meat a cannibal giant is wolfing down:

(22) kkiy, kámáč áka kókówthpo, tóneht espatanéhlakkke, yol kpakékásikanal...

\[ \text{kkíy} \quad \text{kámáč=a[k.a]} \quad \text{koków-} \]

\[ \text{ah!} \quad \text{very=QT} \quad \text{rough-eat.?AN-W} \]

\[ \text{ton=eht} \quad \text{[e]-asp-atan.e-hl.o-w-k-e} \quad \text{[e]-takak-qi-t-e} \]

\[ \text{how=UNC C-high-mountain.?} \quad \text{NEG=ANcj-ABS.IN} \quad \text{C-ending.at...-look.?} \]

\[ \text{yol} \quad \text{kahpak-ek-as-k.an-al} \]

\[ \text{these.INpl thick-sheet-cut-generic.NM-INpl} \]

‘Ah! He really ate with gusto, how much those thick slices formed a heap...’

\( (\text{Kállkope:6}) \)

--- gemination? (phonologically similar) negation? (since would normally expect -\text{anokke})

“unreachable” extent of effort = ‘no matter how...’:

(23) tónepeht elalóhkete, natáhtotte wapàkahašnsañhtáwawawayal.

\[ \text{ton-pa-eht} \quad \text{[e]-ol-alóh.k.e-t-e} \]

\[ \text{how=POT=UNC C-in...way-work.?} \quad \text{ANcj-} \]

\[ \text{natahto-tte} \quad \text{wa-po̱kà-ahsan.ii-h.t.aw.ó-w-[w]-al} \]

\[ \text{not=EMP 3-effectively-power.?AN3-[caus].towards.dir NEG-W-} \]

‘No matter what he did, he never matched him in power.’

\( (\text{msáhtawe:23}) \)

- a rather common collocation in Penobscot narratives; again fits pattern of

init.ch. + cj (for realis event/degree) + absentative (for unreachable/infinite sense )

= the no matter of ‘no matter what/how...’.
Note: two forms in (20) do not overtly and unambiguously demonstrate initial change, but
- 2 two points support ch.subjunctive:
  (1) glosses don’t fit the conditional/counterfactual sense of unchanged conj.
  (2) (for what it’s worth) Siebert field notes independently explicitly label as “changed subjunctives”
- limited. distribution of unambiguous initial change + limited corpus = jury still out
- ---however, all available evidence is consistent with and expected from the absentative conjunct model as applied to changed subjunctives

An absentative (conjunct?) etymology for ččike ‘when?’

(24) ččikeč mina kənamihol.‘

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{ččike-č} & \text{mina} & kə-nam.h.o-l-əp \\
\text{when=FUT} & \text{again} & 2-sec.caus.2pat-P
\end{array}
\]

‘When will I see you again?’ (S.D.:38)

(25) ččike opkótethe.‘

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ččike} & \text{opk-ət.e-(w)-aht.e-w} \\
\text{when} & \text{open-?.?c(W)-sit.?.()-W}
\end{array}
\]

‘When is it open?’ (S.D.:100)

Partial solution: if interrogative ‘when?’ by definition refers to a time non-immediate/non-available to the speaker, then absentative [-e] at the end of ččike makes sense, even more so if /-k/ preceding [-e] is an old IN conjunct\(^\text{26}\) form of putative *|ahčt|\(^\text{27,28}\)

Cross-linguistic parallels: morphologically compositional ‘if’ in Somali and Tsou

Somali háddíi ‘if’

- “non-remote” vs. “remote” definite article distinction:

(26) a. nágag-ta ‘the woman (non-remote)’
   b. nágag-tíi ‘the woman (remote)’

   \[
   \begin{array}{l}
   \text{nín-ka} \quad \text{‘the man (non-remote)’} \\
   \text{nín-kíi} \quad \text{‘the man (remote)’}
   \end{array}
   \]

   (ad. from Saeed 1999:(114))

Saeed 1999:112: “If the referent of the noun is distant from the speaker, or is in the past, the remote forms kíi/tíi are used; the article ka/ta is unmarked spatially, and is used for referents temporally located in the present and future.”

- remote definite article: ‘past’, ‘distant’ semantics = nearly exactly definition of absentative

key observation (Saeed 1999:222):
- fem. noun hád ‘moment, point in time; case, instance’ + (fem.) remote article -tíi
  = head of Somali conditional clauses...i.e. háddíi = ‘if...’:

(27) Haddii aad furaysaan albaabka, dirin igu duuduuba ee i tiirya.

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Hadd-d-tíi} & \text{aad} & \text{fur-ay-saan} & \text{albaab-ka} & \text{dirin}
\end{array}
\]
time-the.F-RMT 2 open-PRG-2pl.SUB door-the.M dirin
i-ku dauduub-a ee i tiiriy-a.
1.ACC-with... wrap-2pl.IMPR and 1.ACC [make.stand.up]-2pl.IMPER

‘If you [pl] open the door, wrap me up in a dirin [a kind of mat] and stand me up.’”
(adapted from SCS:Gabadhii Caqliga Badnayd; accents omitted)

-> Somali = another case of a distancing morpheme + subordinator\(^{29}\) = ‘if...’ (= cj+abs in Penobscot)

**Tsou hoci ‘if’**

- prenominal ne ‘realis’ and ho ‘irrealis’ (Ya-yin Melody Chang, p.c. 2003)
- they distinguish realis ‘yesterday’ and irrealis ‘tomorrow’:
  
  \[(28)\] a. ne hucma ‘yesterday’
  
  b. ho hucma ‘tomorrow’  
  
  *hucma = lit. ‘a day from now [w/ temporal direction unspecified]’

- **ho ‘irrealis’ seems to form part of hoci = Tsou ‘if’ element:**
  
  \[(29)\]

  \[\text{hoci } \text{cuma} \text{ na} \text{ i-ko} \text{ .mn..a,} \text{ naho ea-a}\]

  ‘If you like anything, please take it’
  
  (adapted from Chang 2000:16:(45a))

  2\(^{nd}\) element in hoci = Tsou subordinating element ci (occurs post- or pre-clausally):
  
  \[(30)\]

  \[\begin{array}{llllll}
  \text{a.} & \text{o-h-} & \text{'u-cu} & \text{ait-i} & \text{'o} & \text{o-h-si} & \text{tpos-i} \\
  \text{b.} & \text{o-h-} & \text{'u-cu} & \text{ait-i} & \text{'o} & \text{tpos-i} & \text{ci} & \text{o-h-si} \\
  \text{NAF-Rea-1S-Perf} & \text{see-PF} & \text{Nom} & \text{NAF-2S} & \text{like-PF} & \text{please} & \text{take-PF} \\
  \text{NAF-Rea-1S-Perf} & \text{see-PF} & \text{Nom} & \text{book} & \text{ci} & \text{NAF-2S} & \text{write-PF} & \text{Obl Pasuya} \end{array}\]

  ‘The book that was written by Pasuya was read by me.’  
  
  (adp. from Chang 1998:69:(17))

- **hoci = ho ‘irrealis’ + ci ‘relativizer’ = Penobscot cj + abs., in reverse**

**Directive locative: an absentative locative?**

Penobscot reflex of Proto-Algonquian locative *-enki\(^{30}\) is |-\(_{\text{ok}}\|:

\[(31)\] m\(_{\text{ok}}\text{hkanak}\) ‘at the fish hook; Magegunuck [=] Portland, Maine.’

  (cf. m\(_{\text{ok}}\text{hkan}\) IN ‘fish hook’) (PD:273)

- |-\(_{\text{ok}}\| = “directive locative” (PD): prim. indicates the goal towards which a motion is directed:

\[(32)\]

  a. m\(_{\text{ok}}\text{natan}\) IN ‘hillock, knoll, hill, large mound’
  
  b. m\(_{\text{ok}}\text{natanok}\) ‘at/on the hill’
  
  c. m\(_{\text{ok}}\text{natanoke}\) ‘towards the hillock, at the hill in the distance’\(^{31}\) (PD:275)

\[(33)\]

  a. m\(_{\text{ok}}\text{hkomak\(_{\text{ok}}\)}\) IN ‘the Micmac country’
  
  b. m\(_{\text{ok}}\text{hkomak\(_{\text{ok}}\)}\) ‘in the Micmac country’
  
  c. m\(_{\text{ok}}\text{hkomak\(_{\text{ok}}\)}\) ‘in the Micmac country, toward the Micmac country’  
  
  (PD:278)

- **directive locative |-\(_{\text{ok}}\| = plain locative |-\(_{\text{ok}}\| + |-\(_{\text{e}}\|**

  again: this |-\(_{\text{e}}\| = IN absentative singular morpheme |-\(_{\text{e}}\|
Semantic arguments for dir. loc. to be abs. loc.:

- “directive” meaning fits that of the absentative: a location viewed as the goal of a direction is by definition inaccessible, absent from the present/local point of reference

- **similative** extension of dir. loc. also fits absentative semantics:

  (34) \( \text{kamóč áł'ka kínopto, ónsa áł'ka èl̂éwe awéhsohsáke, ál̂ópto.} \)

  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{kamóč}=áł'ka & \quad \text{kin-òp.t.aw-}[w] & \quad \text{ónsa}=áł'ka \\
  \text{very}=\text{QT} & \quad \text{big-[track].T.}\text{?ás-W} & \quad \text{truly}=\text{QT} \\
  \text{èl̂éwe} & \quad \text{aweōhsohs-ák̂e} & \quad \text{ál̂óp.t.àw-}[w] \\
  \text{almost} & \quad \text{bear-LOC-ABS.IN} & \quad \text{in...way-[track].T.}\text{?án-W} \\
  \end{align*}
  \]

  ‘He made very large footprints, in fact he left tracks of a kind almost like a bear’s.’ \( \text{(wáskekkehs:8)} \)

  (35) \( \ldots \text{kámóč áł'ka, wa áwen, kínopto, měhč áł'k̂eht ák̂ōmake, átōp̂̂oto.} \)

  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{kamóč}=áł'ka & \quad \text{wa} & \quad \text{awen} & \quad \text{kin-òp.t.àw-}[w] \\
  \text{very}=\text{QT} & \quad \text{this.AN} & \quad \text{someone} & \quad \text{big-[track].T.}\text{?ás-W} \\
  \text{měhč}=áł'k̂eht & \quad \text{ák̂ōm-ák̂e} & \quad \text{átōt-òp.t.àw-}[w] \\
  \text{approx.=QT=UNC} & \quad \text{snowshoe-LOC-ABS.IN} & \quad \text{to...degree-[track].T.}\text{?án-W} \\
  \end{align*}
  \]

  ‘...this person made a big track, comparable to the size of a snowshoe, so great was the footprint made’ \( \text{(Ksīlskope:2)} \)

- “directive” \(<->\) “similative”: approaching, nearing... (in English similative sense)
  ...i.e. literal spatial motion sense reread/recast as stative dislocation

  =the gulf between the referent’s actual characteristics, and those of whatever it is likened to:

  (36) With a look approaching absolute disgust, she left.

- similative -ak̂-e thus derives from abs. not only via directive sense, but also via relationship with ‘if’:
  -cf. English similatives in as if...,..., and similar patterns in Penobscot:

  (37) \( \ldots \text{ónsa máñana matkamikihpóteke} \)

  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{ónsa} & \quad \text{máñana} & \quad \text{mat-ahkamikhpot.ē-k̂e} \\
  \text{truly} & \quad \text{as.if} & \quad \text{move-[land]-[oscillate].TINcj-ABS.IN} \\
  \end{align*}
  \]

  ‘...in fact it seemed as if the earth trembled.’ \( \text{(kāloskope nākā tolape#1:10)} \)

- similative máñana ‘as if, like’ matched w/ ‘if’-clause
  = matkamikihpóteke ‘if there is earth-trembling’\(^{33}\)

- assuming absentative-‘if’ semantic relationship, then absentativity underlies both the morphology and the semantics of the directive locative, hence absentative locative.\(^{34}\)

Summary

- subjunctive’s and directive locative’s -e is identified with the IN abs. sg. ending -e
- justified on internal semantic grounds, from the semantics of extensions therefrom, and from the semantics of the collocations they enter into
- absentative conjunct analysis for ‘if’-clauses (conditional, counterfactual) has direct parallels in other unrelated languages (Somali, Tsou); abs. loc. analysis of dir. loc. has parallels in English
V. The beginnings of a solution for an old PA to PEA problem?

"Less easily explained is the continuation of PA *-e marking the subjunctive mode as PEA *-ē (< Unami -e, Eastern Abenaki -ê), or the source of the absentative singular endings PEA *-a (anim.) and *-ē (inan.). Unami lākhwa ‘man (absent or dead), imply ‘water (that is all gone)?" (Goddard 1979:99)

- the absentative conjunct analysis hints at a link between PA *-e subjunctive and PEA *-ē ‘ABS.IN’
- but exactly what link?

ABBREVIATIONS

- [...] (in morpheme glosses) indicates incompletely parsed morpheme
- 1, 2, 3, AN, IN 1st, 2nd, 3rd person, animate, inanimate agreement marker
- 1pl 1st person plural (exclusive, unless otherwise specified via “in” or “ex”)
- ≠1pl non-1st person plural (i.e. 2nd or 3rd person plural)
- direct patient marker: transitive action flowing outward wrt locality
- inverse patient marker: transitive action flowing inward wrt locality
- P local referent marker -ap
- W non-local referent marker -[w], “initial-izer” -aq[w]
- N morpheme (multi-functional)
- C initial change (of changed conjunct)
- R reduplication
- M possessive marker -om; ??transitive -on (cf. L for similar -l)
- T prefix[detransitive/nominalizer]
- ? un glossed morpheme; especially abstract final
- IWJ the suffix -ij[w], a sort of adverbializer
- cj conjunct
- obv obviative
- unspec unspecified referent
- perf perfective aspect
- caus causative
- xpl extended-plural (forms AI stems)
- POT potential enclitic
- FUT future enclitic
- QT quotative enclitic
- FOC focus enclitic
- EMP emphatic (intensifying) enclitic
- UNC uncertainty marker (enclitic)
- DEIC deictic enclitic (used primarily in presentatives)
- SAN, PAN apparent evidentials -ašah and -apan that seem to indicate something like a
- dubitative and non-dubitative preterite/anterior respectively; exact usage remains unclear
- NAF non-agent focus (Tsou)
- Nom nominative (Tsou)
- Rea realis (Tsou)
- F feminine (Somali)
- RMT remote (Somali)
- ACC accusative (Somali)
- NAF non-agent focus (Tsou)
- Nom nominative (Tsou)
- Obl oblique (Tsou)
- Rea realis (Tsou)
- F feminine (Somali)
- RMT remote (Somali)
- ACC accusative (Somali)
- PRG progressive (Somali)
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1 See section III for discussion of this variant.

2 The attestational gap in this corner of the paradigm is more likely due to a data gap then a genuine paradigmatic one. The overall system suggests *tyeka*l and *tyeka* respectively as reasonable reconstructions.

3 Following the pattern of other demonstratives, these two forms should also have variants as *oweke* and *oweke* respectively, but this is not clearly attested.

4 It is interesting to note that the Penobscot supradistals appear to be made from the same morphological material as is Pentland 2000a,b reports for the Cree and Fox strict absentatives: namely, an [a]-element. Given that this is one rather common vocalic syllable, this is not exactly an ironclad etymology for the Penobscot forms; but I would at least observe that of the three distality ranges (proximal, distal, and supradistal), the supradistal is the one most similar to the absentative, being closest to its “inaccessible” or “distant” sense.

5 I have yet to locate examples of absensive concord with numerals or participle conjuncts, which would be expected.

6 Below is the only other potential example of full concord that I have been able to locate:

(a) niyo ehtah-sii’ak, pechhlate ahtomo, waniiswiihottakal-mehcinekalk

nt yo [e],htaah-sii’an-k pet-hl.e-t-e ahtomo
so this IN C.every-spring,?\textsc{inh}NCj arrive-go,?\textsc{inh}NCj-ABS.IN not[existential?]

wo-nis-ow.i-hott.i-\textsc{e}kal meht-e-[w]-\textsc{e}kal
Absolutivity in Penobscot
Conor M. Quinn
35th Algonquian Conference

3-two-W.?AN=pl.ANcj-ABS.otb
end-suffer.?AN=ABS.otb
‘Then here every spring, when he arrived, his spouse (oblv. abs. eg) was not [in existence]—she was dead.’

| (keelhlot) (G.D.: first version, not later one; from S:30:1) |

This appears just to be a case of continued reference, since the transcription explicitly notes the pause between the two words. There is a note that these forms listed under a column labelled “surprise,” presumably because of the glosses, which suggest that the interaction of the absolutive with the as-yet unclear evidential function of the sahaniti morpheme derives a derivative reading. These may have been the forms Siebert was referring to when he recounted to me an anecdote in which he witnessed a Penobscot speaker using the negative (“possessive,” in his preferred terms) in reference to a baby asleep in the other room; this is not quite clear. ([RF]still need to work on PAN forms in S:72:41 and S:72:49)

The gloss for the Penobscot Dictionary ms. entry alhioiwolotatok ‘they went at a previous time’ (PD:50) may come from this textual example.

5
Compare this transcription, by Speck, with the phonetically similar kæækiliæhæs recorded by Siebert. This may be interspeaker variation, or just inter-recorder variation.

6
Speck’s original form seems to reflect thtkatkal, which could well be this speaker’s use, since the form is onomatopoetic.

11
The transcription here suggests geminate /al/, but most other attestations of this form, as well as cognates from related languages, suggest plain /æl/.

12
Hard to say if this is from /æl-æl-æl/ or /æl-æl-æl/.

13
Note here that /æl- abs. ag/ does not labelize under the influence of preceding /æl/, unlike /æl-‘oblv. pl./. Contrast this form with wakstaka ‘AN’s knees (oblv. pl.). This lack of labialization fits with Goddard 1979’s model of the AN absolutive’s history: only PA *Cwaa(C) ever went to *Cwaa(C), and never *Cwaar(C).

14
This form is unexpected and perhaps is an error for *ntapåsmakak. Even then the resulting form has an extremely unusual accent, since

15
Note that /ntapåsmakak/ was almost certainly a typographical error for *ntapåtsikak.

16
There is one of the cases of the non-extant penultimate accent pattern extending to the singular: an example of an ‘intensive possessive’ form using possessive marker mænt used with the same stem as in (17c):

(b) a. nontatollhówemak AN ‘my own former....’, pl. nontatollhówemakak
b. nontatollhówemak AN ‘my own former....’, pl. nontatollhówemakak

I have unearthed nothing comparable to the underlined form, though the aforementioned unusual accent of non-extant *ntapåsmakak (see RFb) might be a transcription of a secondary accent where the main accent is on the penult, i.e. of *ntapåsmakak. This would fit the above association of penultimate accentuation for non-extant absolutives. But then we would expect nontatollhówéka rather than attested nontatollhówéka for the non-extant form without intensive possessive—unless the presence of the intensive possessive morpheme is somehow a relevant factor.

18 A further twist, and, frustratingly, apparently a hapax legomenon: /iæk/ for an unsuffixed singular absolutive: nišosa ‘my deceased daughter’ vs.

19 This, by normal sound change is almost certainly the source of the abstract V discussed for cognate Pamaamokwut-Malisseeet forms in LeSourd 1993. Unfortunately, due to the peripheral nature of the morpheme, such an analysis cannot be verified synchronically in that language, as LeSourd rightly laments.

20 The occasional use of Penobscot subjunctives with the gloss ‘whom’... with regard to future/irrealis events parallels languages such as Indonesian, which distinguishes reals waktn ‘when...’ and irrealis kalau ‘when (future)...; if...’ rather consistently. This once again fits into the tight relationship (leading to conflation, much possibly just on my part) between irrealis and absolutive: a conceptualization of irrealis events as inaccessible, and therefore subject to absolutive marking in morphology.

21 Penultimate accentuation for non-extant absentatives. But then we would expect *ntapåsmakak rather than attested nontatollhówéka for the non-extant form without intensive possessive—unless the presence of the intensive possessive morpheme is somehow a relevant factor.

22 While realis vs. irrealis is relevant to the choice of absolutive or plain conjuncts, the relationship is not one-to-one. Irrealis events-times such as conditionals and counterfactuals do require absolutive marking, but so do realis-but-unavailable ones such as those denoted by the changed subjunctive. I suspect that the primary problem here is an inadequacy in analytical and terminological distinctions: irrealis–realis is too broad and too simple.

23 The related distancing effect produced by anterior morpheme ñosahän here has parallels in many languages (cf. Latisiou (missing ref?); a similar

24 This motivation for the negative is unclear, but reminiscent of some Romance and dialectal English irrealis/subjunctive constructions that require a seemingly “illogically” negative. More confusing is why both negative and positive forms appear in these sorts of constructions in Penobscot.

25 In the following example, the gloss is somewhat unclear, but assuming that how he would become in size is meant as an embedded exclamative, then again we have a case of changed absolutive conjunct used to convey discursively “unreachable” degree.

(c) modälam eht, ton elsklikke, ñasahä ña kísik, kís-pamamokwutnowiw polotosanunik

modälam=eht ton [e] olak—d—w—e ñasahä=ña
at.length=UNC how C—in.—way-of-size, ?AN=NEG=ANcj-ABS.IN

ñasahä=ña?

ñasahä=ña

ñasahän=ñk those.AN C—[person]—eat.?AN=pl.—xpl.—SANT=ANp

‘At length presumably, how he would become in size[,] evidently these ones had partaken of human flesh.’ (Kellippe:7)

26 Or perhaps locative; see next subsection.

27 Such an analysis might further explain why eikle alone of the interrogatives does not have an indefinite use...though exactly how I am not sure.

28 Such an analysis might further explain why ñasahän is also a plausible analysis for Pamaamokwut-Malisseeet ñasahän ‘when’... as well: it terminates in conjunct/locative-hinting /-ë/, and has a final low accent explainable as a missing historical /-ë/, or just as the synchronous IN absolutive, which takes its primary form (i.e. excluding issues of stem-final vowel deletion and recovery/reshapmg) as a low accent on the final syllable of the (untruncated) stem. Once again, however, there is no way to be

29 Here there seems to be an overt relativized head for the complementizer, i.e. this ñasahän; comparable overt heads are found for other types of Somali complementizers; see Saeed 1999:224 for details.

30 Tantalizingly similar to the conjunct of an IN verbal final in /-en...and at least from this diachronic perspective, one could argue this (as the source of the locative) as a sort of quick and dirty conjunct of an IN existential.

31 Note in particular the phrase ‘in the distance’ involved in the gloss, reflecting the “distancing” sense of the absolutive.

32 In his final version of this text, Siebert sees this similitative usage of the “locative conjunct” as unusual enough to warrant a footnote. He glosses the form avëëlsolake as ‘at the bear’s place; as a bear, like a bear’s —, like that of a bear’, and notes that it is an example of “a special use of the directive conjunct which is found in several other Algonquian languages.”
A comparable example of similitative element matching absentative conjunct is the following:

(d) \[\ldots\\text{wrtepa}h	ext{zhkzn po\tepal, a\tkitanok, t\dahlawapa lpt, skowtam\dawis\daze}.\]

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{watep-
\dahkhelokan} & \text{potepal} & \text{a\tkitanok, t\dahlawapa lpt, skowtam\dawis\daze}. \\
\text{3-into. vehicle-throw.DOAN-L.dirAN-N} & \text{[whale]-obv} & \text{[canoe]-LOC} \\
\hline
\text{tahalaw=apa} & \text{ip-tw} & \text{askowtam-aw.i-t-asahant-e} \\
\text{like=POT} & \text{only-IW1} & \text{[trout]-W\dawjANcij-SAN-ABS.IN} \\
\end{array}\]

‘...[he] tossed the whale into the canoe as though he were a trout’ (k. nz`kz to`lrpe\#1:6)

Here the similitative \text{tahlaw} ‘like’ is matched by an absentative conjunct \text{skowtam\awis\daze} ‘if AN were a trout’.

A plain locative may be factually inaccessible, but not discursively so. Just as Penobscot can talk about literally dead individuals without explicitly marking them as unavailable, so too non-immediate places can have the same treatment, and thereby take only the plain locative. What is key is that when the notion of is discursively relevant—precisely when direction rather than immediate location is involved—then the inherent sense of non-immediacy forces that forces the presence of an absentative.